REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-15 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-15 stand rejected. Claims 2, 8 and 16 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10-12 are objected to for certain informalities.

1. Regarding Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended as set forth above such that the objected to language has been deleted. Therefore, the objection to Claim 1 has been rendered moot.

2. Regarding Claims 5, 6, and 10-12, Claims 5, 6, and 10-12 have been amended as set forth above in accordance with the Office's suggestion. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to Claims 5, 6, and 10-12 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bebee et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,204,856). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

1. Regarding Claims 1, and 4-6, Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "A method for reducing a required signal-to-noise ratio in a time division multiple access (TDMA) link of a mobile network, the network including a first node and a second node, the method comprising: receiving at the first node, in an initial TDMA time slot, an initial TDMA signal burst from the second node, the initial TDMA signal burst comprising a single first preamble; determining initial link state variables of a link between the first and second nodes by utilizing a first preamble included in the initial TDMA signal burst, thereby synchronizing the first node to the initial TDMA signal burst; receiving at the first node, in a subsequent TDMA time slot, a second TDMA signal burst from the second node, the second TDMA signal burst comprising a single second preamble that is

shorter than the first preamble of the initial TDMA signal burst in the initial TDMA time slot; and updating the initial link state variables utilizing the second preamble."

Applicant respectfully submits that Bebee et al. does not describe show or suggest a method for reducing a required signal-to-noise ratio in a time division multiple access (TDMA) link of a mobile network that includes the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. For example, Bebee et al. does not describe show or suggest such a method that includes receiving at a first node, in an initial TDMA time slot, an initial TDMA signal burst from the second node wherein the initial TDMA signal burst comprises a *single* first preamble. Rather, Bebee et al. describes that each five second time slot for transmission or reception *is divided into a traffic slot, and a probe slot each of 2.5 seconds*. A timing representation 54 expands upon timing representation 52 and shows, for a typical five second slot, that during start-up *the traffic slot may have a two second or long preamble*, and the remaining portion of the two and one-half second time slot contains probe and traffic control data. *The probe slot also has a long, two second preamble*, and the remaining time comprises probe and traffic data identical to that in the traffic slot.

Additionally, one skilled in the art would readily recognize that the method for reducing a required signal-to-noise ratio in a time division multiple access (TDMA) link of a mobile network, as recited in amended Claim 1, deals with purely local link state variables that are used at the receiving end of a link. None of the updates in the link state variables get communicated back to the transmit end. To the contrary, one skilled in the art would readily recognize that Bebee, et al, makes changes at the transmit end of a link and sends information about a probe frequency back to other nodes to allow those nodes to switch respective transmitters to use that frequency.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is distinguishable over Bebee et al. Thus, Bebee et al. does not anticipate the invention as recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Bebee et al.

Claims 4-6 depend from amended Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 4-6 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claims 4-6 are likewise patentable over Bebee et al.

2. Regarding Claims 7 and 10-12, Claim 7 has been amended, as set forth above, to include limitations similar to those recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with respect to amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 7 is also patentable over Bebee et al.

Claims 10-12 depend from amended Claim 7. When the recitations of Claims 10-12 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 7, Applicant submits that Claims 10-12 are likewise patentable over Bebee et al.

3. Regarding Claims 13 and 15, Claim 13 has been amended, as set forth above, to include limitations similar to those recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, in accordance with the remarks set forth above with respect to amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 13 is also patentable over Bebee et al.

Claim 15 depends from amended Claim 13. When the recitations of Claim 15 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 13, Applicant submits that Claim 15 is likewise patentable over Bebee et al.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections of Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13 and 15 be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 9 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bebee et al. in view of Ebringer (U.S. Pat. No. 6,084,852). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

1. Regarding Claim 3, Claim 3 depends from amended Claim 1, which, in accordance with the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit is

patentable over the cited reference, Bebee et al. Thus, when the recitations of Claim 3 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claim 3 is patentable over Bebee et al. in view of Ebringer.

2. Regarding Claim 9, Claim 9 depends from amended Claim 7, which, in accordance with the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit is patentable over the cited reference, Bebee et al. Thus, when the recitations of Claim 9 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 7, Applicant submits that Claim 9 is patentable over Bebee et al. in view of Ebringer.

3. Regarding Claim 14, Claim 14 depends from amended Claim 13, which, in accordance with the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit is patentable over the cited reference, Bebee et al. Thus, when the recitations of Claim 14 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 13, Applicant submits that Claim 13 is patentable over Bebee et al. in view of Ebringer.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of Claims 3, 9 and 14 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7525.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/17/05

By: Scott T. Gray, Reg. No. 48,891

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bohomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-726-7500